

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

08 MAR 19 2008
Clerk's Office File Stamp

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Judge Dana M Sabraw
FROM: J. Hinkle, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 03/18/08
CASE NO.: 07cv2388-DMS(POR) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Michael T Fox, Pro Se
CASE TITLE: Fox v US Attorneys Office et al
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Response to order Denying Dft's add time / Application for Default Judgement

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X	<u>OTHER: Was not served on all parties prior to bringing in to file. No provision for responses to orders in local rules. Application not signed by Dft. Proposed order attached.</u>

Date forwarded: 3/18/08

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.
- Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Sabraw

Dated: 3/18/08
cc: All Parties

By: mm

REJECTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DEIGO CALIFORNIA

PLAINTIFF

MICHAEL T. FOX

CASE NUMBER

07 CV 2388 DMS POR

VERSES

DEFENDANTS

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE .

RESPONSE TO JUDGE SABAROW
ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS EX-
PARTE ORDER FOR ADDITIONAL
TIME TO RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS
PETITION AND COMPLAINT. BY A
1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT.

NOW COMES MICHAEL T FOX THE PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER AND STATES TO THIS HONORABLE
COURT THE FOLLOWING.

- 1) THAT PLAINTIFF FILED A PETITION AND COMPLAINT INCLUDING EXHIBITS 1 THRU 20 IN THE
FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT IN SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA ON DEC 20 2007
- 2) THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNOWN AS THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS AND UNITED
STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICES BEING SERVED ON DEC 28TH 2007
- 3) THE PLAINTIFF MICHAEL FOX DRIVING ACROSS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO WASHINGTON
DC. TO SERVE THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. WITH SERVICE BEING EXECUTED ON
JAN 4TH 2008 ON THE UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTARTMENT
- 4) THAT MICHAEL T FOX THE PLAINTIFF FILED A 1ST AMMENDED COMPLAINT, ONLY IN REGARDS TO THE
STAGED CAR WRECK IN GALVISTON TEXAS ON JANUARY 30 2008.

CR

REJECTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER

MICHAEL T FOX
GENERAL DELIVERY
SAN DEIGO CALIFORNIA 92138

CASE# 07 2388 DMS POR

VERSES

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS
9797 AREO DRIVE
SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA 92123

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE
880 FRONT STREET ROOM
SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE
WASHINGTON DC

Application For
DEFAULT JUDGEMENT AS TO
DEFENDANTS NOT FILING ANSWER
OR FILING EXTENSION OF TIME WITH
60 DAY TIME LIMIT--FURTHER JUDGE
SABRAW DENYING EX-PARTA MOTION
REQUESTING ADDITIONAL TIME TO
FILE AN ANSWER BY DEFENDANTS

THAT THE COMPLAINT AND PETITION OF MICHAEL T FOX THE PLAINTIFF AND THROUGH ITS
EXHIBITS 1 THRU 20-- THAT THIS COMPLAINT AND PETITION NOT BEING ANSWERED WITHIN THE
ANSWER FILING RULE IN FED R. CIV. P. 12(a)(2) IS IN DEFAULT. FURTHERMORE DEFENDANTS
BEING DENIED THERE EXPARTA ORDER GRANTING AND EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE WHICH
WAS FILED ELECTRONICLY ON FEBUARY 26 AT 5:06PM/PST. THAT DEFENDANTS EX-PARTA
MOTION HAS UTTERLY NO MERRIT AND IS IN DEFAULT BY LAW, BY FILING EITHER THERE
ANSWER OR THERE EX-PARTA MOTION SEEKING ADDITIONAL TIME WITH-IN THE 60 DAY RULE.
DEFENDANTS FURTHER BEING DENIED THERE EX PARTA ORDER SEEKING ADDITIONAL TIME
THAT THIS HONORABLE COURT FINDS AS FOLLOWS AS TO THE ORDERS BEING REQUESTED